

VZCZCXYZ0007
PP RUEHWEB

DE RUCNDT #0519/01 1761920
ZNR UUUUU ZZH
P 251920Z JUN 07
FM USMISSION USUN NEW YORK
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2140
INFO RUEHGG/UN SECURITY COUNCIL COLLECTIVE PRIORITY

UNCLAS USUN NEW YORK 000519

SIPDIS

SIPDIS

E.O. 12958: N/A

TAGS: [PREL](#) [PTER](#) [UNSC](#) [PARM](#)
SUBJECT: 1540: UPDATE ON COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

REF: STATE 78188

¶1. (SBU) Summary. Per reftel, USUN has solicited views from 1540 Committee Members on how to handle matrices more broadly and with specific regard to Iran. The Chair (Slovakia) has indicated that he intends to hold a meeting in late June to consider formally how matrices are handled. UNODA has made available a CD-ROM which includes the updated matrices of 76 states prepared by experts. The Iran matrix is included. UNODA is under the erroneous impression that the sub-committee on which the U.S. serves approved the draft Iran matrix (in April 2006 we agreed to take no action on it). At this time it appears there is wide agreement on how to deal with matrices more broadly, but UNODA has essentially forced our hand now on the Iran matrix by including it on the CD-ROM.

¶2. (SBU) USUN also reiterated the willingness of the USG to co-sponsor and provide funding for a 1540 workshop in Jordan, assuming it is held at the Cooperative Monitoring Center (CMC). Our understanding, while nothing is official, is that Jordan has agreed to this and we expect official confirmation shortly. USUN has communicated to UNODA that due to procedural issues, the USG money must go to the CMC itself. This may raise some coordination and logistical issues. USUN is prepared to meet with UNODA to hammer these out as appropriate.

Matrices

¶3. (SBU) Since April 2006, the Committee has not taken any further action on the matrices analyzing states, implementation of Resolution 1540 (2004) that the Committee's experts have prepared. There was broad support for addressing this issue prior to the Donors Conference meeting, currently scheduled for July 11th here in New York. On June 12th, UNODA made available to Committee Members a CD-ROM which contains 76 updated matrices, including Iran. Per reftel, USUN canvassed views on the disposition of the matrices. There appeared to be no opposition to returning matrices to Member States that submitted them as a means to enhance and continue dialogue about implementation of 1540. While Committee Members supported the goal of transparency in theory, it is not clear that there is consensus to support sharing matrices with other States and organizations, even if the individual state in question consents. Some feel Russia and China will invoke the security argument, maintaining that too much transparency might expose weaknesses that could be exploited by those with intentions counter to the goals established by 1540. Privately, several delegations agreed that Russia and China are likely more concerned that maximum transparency will facilitate &criticism8 of Member States whose implementation of 1540 may be lackluster.

¶4. (SBU) Per reftel, USUN solicited views on whether the function of the matrix was simply to summarize information provided by Member States, or should it provide an accurate

picture of States, circumstances. The overwhelming view was that it should simply summarize the information presented. Accuracy, of course, was an ideal goal, but the belief was that if a State provided inaccurate information or was intentionally trying to deceive the Committee, then it would be unlikely to seek assistance or engage in dialogue on that particular issue in any case. Many felt that using experts or outside sources to make submissions more accurate would be highly controversial and might encourage Member States to provide less, not more information. If in fact a state submitted inaccurate or incomplete information, but was sincere in wanting to work with the Committee, then there were better ways to address these shortcomings than by indirectly (or directly) criticizing their voluntary submissions. If in fact a state was being intentionally deceitful, then the issue was moot because there was very little the Committee could or should do in response given the Committee's mandate.

¶5. (SBU) Per reftel, USUN also solicited views on whether or not &approval8 of a matrix constitutes &endorsement8, or is it only administrative function? Consistent with the views noted in para 3, there was consensus that the matrix in no way is meant as a stamp of approval about the validity and veracity of respective Member States, reports upon which the matrix is based. There was an overwhelming sense that the Committee could best serve as a conduit between donors and Member States that requested assistance, and that those Member States seeking assistance would find it in their own self-interest to provide an accurate picture.

¶6. (SBU) Per reftel, USUN sought views from other Committee members about how to dispose of the Iran matrix in particular. USUN sought views from others operating under the assumption that the Iran matrix would not be included for

consideration at the end of the June meeting. Based on the working assumption, all friendly countries spoken to, including the Chair, felt it was better to let the specific case of Iran lay dormant for a while, since the Subcommittee did not approve Iran's matrix in April 2006. Other Committee members more broadly agreed that the Committee should not take any action that might be inconsistent with any decision by the Security Council of Iran's nuclear weapons program. Unfortunately, on June 12th, UNODA made available to Committee members a CD-ROM with 76 updated matrices, one of them being Iran. In essence, the issue is now being forced upon us. USUN has spoken only with the UK, France and the Chair about this issue. The preferred option is that the Iran matrix be &quietly removed8 from consideration at the next meeting. Whether or not this is possible remains unclear. Attempting to block consideration of Iran's matrix would be viewed by several Committee members, notably China and Russia, as outside the mandate of the Committee and unnecessarily provocative.

Jordan Workshop

¶7. (U) USUN spoke with UNODA about our willingness and hope to co-sponsor a 1540-related workshop at Jordan's Cooperative Monitoring Center. UNODA said they had still not received official confirmation from the Jordanians on the site location, but expect to hear shortly that the Jordanians have agreed. Given that the money from the USG must go directly to the CMC itself, UNODA said it would be useful to sit down with USUN to work out logistics. In so doing, UNODA believes they can approach the Jordanians and begin hammering out concrete details, in particular, the date of the conference.

KHALILZAD